

**NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS**

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

**COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
FOURTH APPELLATE DISTRICT  
DIVISION THREE**

In re J.W., a Person Coming Under the  
Juvenile Court Law.

ORANGE COUNTY SOCIAL SERVICES  
AGENCY,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

J.R.,

Defendant and Appellant.

G045868

(Super. Ct. No. DP020676)

**ORDER MODIFYING OPINION  
AND DENYING PETITION FOR  
REHEARING; NO CHANGE IN  
JUDGMENT**

It is ordered that the opinion filed herein on March 21, 2012, be modified as follows:

1. On page 26, add the following final two paragraphs to the opinion:

“Mother asserts we should nonetheless provide parents with a remedy when the statutory time limits for jurisdictional and dispositional hearings are not met. She suggests if outright dismissal of the petition is not a viable remedy, immediate return of the child to parental custody is. We reject her contention.

“The cases Mother cites, *Renee S. v. Superior Court* (1999) 76 Cal.App.4th 187 (*Renee S.*) and *Jeff M. v. Superior Court* (1997) 56 Cal.App.4th 1238 (*Jeff M.*) are inapposite as both concerned a parent’s writ petition seeking to compel the juvenile court to conduct the necessary hearings; neither case directs the juvenile court as

to how it should rule. (*Jeff M.*, *supra*, 56 Cal.App.4th at pp. 1243-1244 [mandate to compel juvenile court to conduct the jurisdictional hearing]; see also *Renee S.*, *supra*, 76 Cal.App.4th at p. 198 [mandate to compel juvenile court to conduct the jurisdictional hearing appropriate, but unnecessary because hearing conducted while writ petition pending].) “‘The paramount purpose underlying dependency proceedings is the protection of the child.’ [Citation.]” (*Richard H.*, *supra*, 234 Cal.App.3d at p. 1362.) Reversing or modifying a jurisdictional or dispositional order supported by the record as being in the best interests of the minor merely to chastise the juvenile court for failing to timely conduct would completely defeat the purpose behind dependency proceedings. (*In re Charles B.* (1986) 189 Cal.App.3d 1204, 1210 [no dismissal based on failure to comply with time limits for filing progress reports].) We have seen no sign that time limits are routinely violated by the juvenile court. And in the rare instances when the problem is not corrected by the bench and bar, a parent has the writ remedy that was pursued by the parents in *Renee S.*, *supra*, 76 Cal.App.4th 187, and *Jeff M.*, *supra*, 56 Cal.App.4th 1238.”

This modification does not effect a change in judgment.

The petition for rehearing is DENIED.

O’LEARY, P. J.

WE CONCUR:

BEDSWORTH, J.

MOORE, J.